

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/553,785	12/02/2005	Innocente Marchante Moreno	125718	3965	
== :	25944 7590 06/21/2007 OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 19928			VANATTA, AMY B		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
·			3765		
•			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/21/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	H					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/553,785	MARCHANTE MORENO ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Amy B. Vanatta	3765				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION AND A THIS COMMUN	DN. timely filed m the mailing date of this communication. IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 D	<u>ecember 2005</u> .					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This	s action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on 21 October 2005 is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11. 	: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance. So tion is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio application from the International Burear * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applica rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ition Noved in this National Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Theories Sur-	or (PTO 413)				
Notice of References Cited (P10-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT0-948)	4)					

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 120205.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: ____.

Application/Control Number: 10/553,785

Art Unit: 3765

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 2. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 is rendered indefinite by the recitation in line 2 "of the kind that use", since the term "use" in this context is not precise. It is unclear whether this "use" means that the item used (i.e. grippers) are actually being recited as forming a part of the drawing system.

In claim 1, line 5, the recitation of sprockets of "large" diameter renders the claim indefinite because the metes and bounds of the term "large" is not ascertainable, since the term is a relative term comparing the size of the claimed sprockets to those of the prior art.

Claim 1 recites "the front end" (line 5), "the outbound strand" (line 6), "the rear end" (line 6), and "the return strand" (lines 6-7) without proper antecedent basis.

In claim 3, the sprockets at "the entry" and at "the exit" are confusing, since it is unclear how these relate to the sprockets previously recited in terms of being at the front end of the outbound strand and the rear end of the return strand. Likewise in claim 8.

In claim 4, line 2, "particularly as claimed in claim 1" renders the claim indefinite since it is not clear whether the claim is positively encompassing all of claim 1 and does not conform to standard U.S. practice. It is suggested that "particularly" be deleted. Likewise in claims 9 and 10.

In claim 5, lines 3-4, the recitation "relatively small diameter" renders the claim indefinite because the metes and bounds of the term "relatively small" is not ascertainable. It is suggested that the diameter size be recited relative to other recited elements, for example "having a diameter smaller than that of 'x' ".

In claim 5, lines 4-5, "the sprocket concerned" renders the claim indefinite since it is unclear to which sprocket this refers.

Claim 6 recites "the output shaft" without proper antecedent basis.

In claim 7, the recitation "relatively small size" renders the claim indefinite because the metes and bounds of the term "relatively small" is not ascertainable. Also, it is unclear relative to what this size is regarded as small.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 4. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stanislaw et al (US 5,255,419).

Stanislaw discloses a drive device for a transverse drawing system as claimed, including tenter rails 32 and 34 having endless chains carrying pin plates 48 which form "grippers" as claimed (col. 7, lines 26-35 and Fig. 3). The device comprises two drive sprockets for driving each chain, including a drive sprocket at the front end and a drive sprocket at the rear end of the chain (see sprockets 46a,46b and 52a,52b; Fig. 3). The drive sprockets are of "large diameter" to the extent claimed, since they are large in comparison to smaller sprockets. Motorized drive means 54a, 54b, 50a, and 50b are associated with the sprockets and are synchronized as claimed. The drive means includes a motor for each sprocket (col. 7, line 60 through col. 8, line 5). The motors for the two associated chain sprockets are synchronized in terms of speed such that the endless chain can run its course around the sprockets. The motors are controlled by a fault circuit which is associated with all of the sprocket drive motors and the operation of the motors is monitored by a computer (col. 8, lines 34-39). Thus, the sprocket motors are feedback controlled electric motors. The torque is clearly divided relatively equally between the front and rear drive sprockets, as in claim 3.

5. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Richter (US 4,497,096).

Richter discloses a drive device for a transverse drawing system as claimed, including rails having endless chains (25,26) carrying "grippers" (clips 27); col. 4, lines 29-47 and Fig. 2. The device comprises two drive sprockets for driving each chain, including a drive sprocket at the front end and a drive sprocket at the rear end of the

chain (see sprockets 23, 24, 28, 29). The drive sprockets are of "large diameter" to the extent claimed, since they are large in comparison to smaller sprockets. Motorized drive means are associated with the sprockets and are synchronized as claimed. That is, motor A drives sprockets 23 and 24, while one of the two motors "B" drives sprocket 28 and the other motor "B" drives sprocket 29 (see Fig. 2 and col. 4, lines 32-44 and 48-53).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 2 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stanislaw et al (US 5,255,419).

Regarding claim 2, Stanislaw discloses a drive device for a transverse drawing system as claimed, including drive sprockets 46a, 46b, 52a, and 52b. Although Stanislaw does not disclose the diameter of the drive sprockets, Stanislaw does disclose that the material being processed is large and thus the apparatus for treating the material must also be large (col. 2, lines 64-67; col. 3, lines 7-11 and 17-20). Stanislaw discloses various considerations associated with these finishing machines due to their large size (col. 2, lines 64-67; col. 3, lines 1-21). Thus, Stanislaw recognizes that the machines are large; hence, the sprockets would also be large. It is

within the ordinary skill in the art, through routine experimentation, to determine the optimal size for the sprockets based upon various considerations such as the dimensions of the material to be treated, the processing speed, the amount of drawing to be performed, and the size of the chain. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use sprockets having a diameter greater than 1.5 meters in the apparatus of Stanislaw, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable range involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

Regarding claim 8, as set forth in the rejection above, Stanislaw discloses two drive sprockets for driving each chain, including a drive sprocket at the front end and a drive sprocket at the rear end of the chain (see sprockets 46a,46b and 52a,52b; Fig. 3). Motorized drive means 54a, 54b, 50a, and 50b are associated with the sprockets and are synchronized as claimed. The drive means includes a motor for each sprocket (col. 7, line 60 through col. 8, line 5). The motors for the two associated chain sprockets are synchronized in terms of speed such that the endless chain can run its course around the sprockets. The motors are controlled by a fault circuit which is associated with all of the sprocket drive motors and the operation of the motors is monitored by a computer (col. 8, lines 34-39). Thus, the sprocket motors are feedback controlled electric motors. The torque is clearly divided relatively equally between the front and rear drive sprockets, as claimed.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 4-7, 9, and 10 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

- 9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- 10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amy B. Vanatta whose telephone number is 571-272-4995. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Welch can be reached on 571-272-4996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/553,785

Art Unit: 3765

Page 8

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Amy B Vanatta
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3765